

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

UNITED THERAPEUTICS)	
CORPORATION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 23-975-RGA-SRF
)	
LIQUIDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)	CONFIDENTIAL –
)	FILED UNDER SEAL
Defendant.)	

**LETTER TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE RICHARD G. ANDREWS
REGARDING LIQUIDIA'S NDA AND FORM OF JUDGMENT**

OF COUNSEL:

Sanya Sukduang
Jonathan Davies
Adam Pivovar
Phillip E. Morton
Rachel Preston
John. A. Habibi
Rosalynd D. Upton
Jordan Landers
COOLEY LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004-2400
(202) 842-7800

Daniel Knauss
Lauren Strosnick
Kyung Taeck Minn
Andrew Lau
COOLEY LLP
3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
(650) 843-5000

Karen E. Keller (No. 4489)
Nathan R. Hoeschen (No. 6232)
SHAW KELLER LLP
I.M. Pei Building
1105 North Market Street, 12th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 298-0700
kkeller@shawkeller.com
nhoeschen@shawkeller.com
Attorneys for Defendant

Annie Beveridge
COOLEY LLP
10265 Science Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92121
(858) 550-6000

Dated: August 6, 2025

Dear Judge Andrews,

Liquidia writes to the Court regarding its NDA No. 213005 (“Liquidia’s NDA”). The FDA approved Liquidia’s NDA on May 23, 2025 for improving exercise ability in both PAH and PH-ILD. Liquidia launched Yutrepia™ on June 2, 2025, and patients are benefitting from treatment. To ensure continuity of care for PAH patients taking Yutrepia™, Liquidia will file a prior approval supplement to its NDA to remove the PH-ILD indication and revert to its previously adjudicated approval for PAH-only in the event of an adverse opinion from this Court on infringement and invalidity of the ’327 patent. We attach a copy of the cover letter for the NDA supplement (Ex. 1) along with the following documents recited in the letter: Dear Healthcare Provider Letter (Ex. 2), Annotated Draft Labeling – Prescribing Information (Ex. 3); and a clean copy of the amended Prescribing Information (Ex. 4).

Liquidia requests a status call with the Court, at its earliest convenience, before issuance of its opinion, to discuss the form of any judgment in this case in view of at least the following:

- This second Hatch-Waxman lawsuit was filed based on an amendment to Liquidia’s NDA to add the PH-ILD indication, and the claims of the ’327 patent are directed to PH-ILD;
- This Court previously adjudicated Liquidia’s PAH-only label for Yutrepia™;
- UTC’s pre-trial assertion that it is seeking a judgment pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(4)(A) limited to PH-ILD (*see, e.g.*, Plaintiff’s Brief Statement of Intended Proofs, ¶25);
- Liquidia’s counterclaims of invalidity and non-infringement of the ’327 patent (D.I. 12, ¶¶12-32), and UTC’s claims for damages (D.I. 8, Prayer for Relief ¶5); and
- The potential adverse consequences for patients in the event their access to Yutrepia™ is disrupted in view of Yutrepia’s™ unique product profile.

Counsel for Liquidia is available at the Court’s convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Nathan R. Hoeschen

Nathan R. Hoeschen (No. 6232)

cc: Clerk of the Court (by CM/ECF)
All counsel of record (by CM/ECF & Email)